difficulties in the matter. The Member stated that there were about 4,500 acres of unregistered waste lands in the Trivandrum taluk still available for registry and the occupants of some of those lands might at any time be evicted therefrom. He suggested that the disposal of that area should be expedited by the appointment of a special staff or by the delegation of special powers to the existing staff as had been done in the *pakuthies* of Kaliyal, Neyyattinkara, Konni, &c.

The Member then submitted the following proposals for the consideration of Government :—

(1) For the disposal of *puduval* work, a special department should be created, or a Tahsildar with a staff of surveyors be appointed for the whole State, or one extra Tahsildar be appointed for each Revenue Division, or a Deputy Tahsildar with the powers of a Tahsildar be appointed for each taluk.

(2) Particulars of the unregistered lands in each taluk still available for registry should be published for the information of the public.

(3) All applications for *puduval* lands should be registered in the Sub-Registry Offices on payment of a small fee.

(4) When applications were disposed of, information should be furnished to the applicants.

(5) Large areas should be granted to a single individual, only when they were not required for small holdings for the benefit of the poor.

(6) The registry of areas not brought under cultivation within 5 years from the date of registry should be cancelled and the lands granted to others.

(7) Occupancy rights over *puduval* lands should be made inalienable.

(8) Alienations of registered lands within 5 years from the date of registry should not be allowed.

(9) No applicant should be permitted to occupy unregistered areas before registry was effected.

(10) Arrears of tax for the period before the date of registry should not be imposed.

(11) A uniform rate of *tharavila* should be fixed and published.

(12) Cart tracks should be provided in large areas of *puduval* lands.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

8. Hardships experienced by the poor people on account of the present policy of Government in the matter of *puduval* registry.

Mr. D. Kumaran Potti (Member, Pathanamthitta taluk) thanked the Government for the partition of the Chengannur taluk into two and the creation of the Pathanamthitta taluk. He stated that poor ryots occupied and improved portions of unregistered waste lands in the hills lying near the forests before they applied for registry and that very often the lands in their occupation and enjoyment were being registered in the names of other persons. In certain cases objections were raised and disputes arose and the lands under dispute brought to sale by auction. Poor ryots who were in possession and enjoyment of the lands were proceeded against under the Land Conservancy Regulation and evicted therefrom. He also submitted that, in disregard of the applications from natives of the State, the lands in several cases were being granted to foreigners and also registered in the names of relations of officials. He, therefore, made the following proposals for the consideration of Government :—

(1) A Committee consisting of trustworthy officials and respectable non-officials should be appointed for each taluk and the Taluk authorities should, in the matter of registry of *puduval* lands, be guided by their advice.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(2) *Puduval* lands should be granted to poor natives of the taluk in small lots of 5 or 10 acres.

(3) A preliminary enquiry should be conducted in regard to every *puduval* application to see whether the applicant had effected improvements on the lands applied for.

(4) Lands within Reserves suitable for cultivation should be disafforested and registered in the names of poor persons.

(5) A uniform rate of *tharavila* for *puduval* lands should be fixed for the whole State and no discretion should be allowed to the Revenue officers to fix the rate of *tharavila*.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

9. Policy of Government in the matter of the disposal of Government land.

Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai B. A., B. L. (Member, T. I. C., Kottayam) said that the recent events of the Brander murder and the shooting tragedy at Nedumangad had brought the question of land policy to the unusually large and prominent attention of Government and the people. According to the legislative definitions given of 'Government land,' there were three varieties (*Vide* section 3 of Regulation IV of 1091). The first was land over which no other rights except that of Government existed and to which no manner of obligations was annexed, and as an example he quoted Government waste lands. The second variety was land reserved for communal or public purposes and the third was unassigned lands of incorporated Devaswoms. He then explained how, in his interpretation of the existing Puduval Rules, they worked unsatisfactorily and proceeded to consider the restrictions and lines on which Government should dispose of land under its control. The modern theory was that lands belonging to the State were not the property either of the Sovereign or of the subjects exclusively and that the latter had some concurrent rights in State-lands. It was in acceptance of that principle that many of the colonies thought fit to put ring-fences round their State-land to keep back the foreign elements. Other people had also been actuated by the same principle of self-interest. Travancore too seemed to have respected the above doctrine till a few years ago and a notification prohibiting Europeans and Americans from acquiring land in the State used to be published annually in the English *Almanac and Directory*; but it had ceased to appear in the recent issues of that publication. Though the Puduval Rules conceded preferential claims to His Highness' subjects, such a declaration had not been of much practical avail to meet the situation. The Member's contention was that none but His Highness' subjects should be allowed to hold land in Travancore. If any foreigner wanted land, he should first swear allegiance to His Highness' Throne as a subject. To alienate land in favour of foreigners was a violation of the rights of the subjects and it brought in its train several difficulties—both political and administrative. The foreigners claimed immunity from local laws and regulations which bound all subjects of the State. Another serious evil was that foreign capitalists entered into keen competition with the natives to the distinct disadvantage of the latter. As a result of such admittedly unequal competition, the economic condition of the country had become crippled and diminished. The Member quoted Lord Selborne who in advocating a new land policy for England observed thus:—"We want to see the greatest possible number living on the land. We want to see the agricultural labourer assured of a good wage, of a good house and a good garden. More than that, we want to see him assured of the prospect of becoming a cultivator of the land himself and eventually an owner. We want in fact an agricultural ladder which will enable a man to rise on the land just as he can rise in any other walk of life." The land policy of the State should, he said, be actuated by such a spirit. The usual ground on which lands were being registered, *viz.*, that they were unoccupied, was not a safe procedure, as the argument of the Member was that there was no land which might be said to be absolutely evacuated. The adoption of the principle that the people could be evicted by Government was hardly consistent with the theory of Hindu States which was, according to Manu, that he who entered on

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly